

REMARKS

I. Status of Claims

The above amendments and following remarks are in response to the non-final Office Action dated June 13, 2008.

Claims 1-15 are currently pending in the application. Claims 10, 12, and 14 have been withdrawn from consideration. Upon entry of this response, Claims 1, 11, 13, and 15 will have been amended. Support for these amendments may be found at least at, for example, page 46, lines 12-25, of the original specification. No new matter has been introduced. Entry and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

II. Response to Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102, 103

Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by JP 2001197347 to Itou (“Itou”). Claims 1, 7-9, 11, and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Itou in view of US 6,539,177 to Parulski (“Parulski”). Claims 2 and 3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Itou in view of Parulski and US 4,910,599 to Hashimoto (“Hashimoto”). Claims 4-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Itou in view of Parulski and US 5,838,371 to Hirose et al. (“Hirose”). Applicant traverses these rejections.

Independent Claims 1, 11, and 13 have been amended to provide for inhibiting second signal processing when the magnification ratio reaches the limit for enlargement by the second signal processing. Likewise, Claim 15 has been amended to include first and second maximum magnification ratios for electrical zoom, and extracting a partial image from a first

enlarged image at a magnification ratio between the first and second maximum magnification ratios.

Itoh teaches “warning” signals for possible degradation of image quality.

Even if the warnings can be turned off, as asserted by the Examiner in combining Itoh and Parulski, the cited references still teach that the magnification ratio can be increased indefinitely after the appearance of the warning. This is wholly different from the claimed configurations because the cited references do not inhibit electrical zoom operation beyond specific, predetermined magnification ratios, such as the maximum magnification ratio for the second signal processing.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully asserts that none of the cited references, alone or combined, teaches or suggests the claimed combinations. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of the pending claims under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are presently in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT AUTHORIZATION

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for consideration of this Amendment to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 1232-5318.

In the event that an extension of time is required, or which may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for an extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to Deposit Account No 13-4500, Order No. 1232-5318.

Respectfully submitted,
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Dated: September 12, 2008

By: Matthew D. Eggerding
Matthew D. Eggerding
Registration No. 58,747

Correspondence Address:

Address Associated With Customer Number:
27123

(202) 857-7887 Telephone
(202) 857-7929 Facsimile